ICANN81 | AGM – At-Large Policy Session: Overview of the CPWG
Sunday, November 10, 2024 – 10:30 to 12:00 TRT

BRENDA BREWER: Hello and welcome to the At-Large session overview of the CPWG. My name is Brenda Brewer and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom.

On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. And now, I will hand the floor over to Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Avri Doria, co-chairs of the CPWG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Brenda. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And welcome, everyone to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group meeting, not call, face-to-face meeting. Avri is sitting a bit further down the table. You will see her a little bit later in the call. We're going to do our usual format, which is to go through the agenda and adopt it or make any amendments if we need to make them. So, we'll start with our review of action items, and then, after that, we'll have our policy work group and small team updates.

In there, we'll have Steinar Grotterod on the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Then we will have also an update from Satish Babu, a short update on the Latin Diacritics Policy Development Process, which is pending GNSO decision. After that, the Implementation Review Team updates will consist mostly of the Subsequent Procedures, Implementation Recommendation Review Team with Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

And then, after this, we'll go through our policy. What we call the policy pipeline, which is the usual public consultations that ICANN sends out. Avri will take us through various statements that are either in progress or pending decision or consultations that we have not responded to yet. And then after this, we'll be looking at preparing for the board engagement. Well, first, a follow-up on the prep week session that took place before, and maybe check with the feedback, the community feedback on the Registration Directory Request Service, RDRS. I think I got the acronym right. It's my first session. I haven't got enough coffee yet.

So that's the agenda for today. Do note that I'm speaking more slowly than usual because Heidi is within reach and I'm a little worried about her hitting me if I speak too fast. So, I'm taking time. That should also give you time to think about any changes, modifications, additions or deletions to the agenda. So I'll open the floor if there are such.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. If I can jump in for a second. One of the things we talked about doing slightly differently, and we're really not all that far away, I can actually see you, is that for anyone that's new to the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group, and one of the things is trying to translate the acronyms, that once sort of why do you do this, why do you do it this way, et cetera, feel free to ask that kind of question, too.

And I think as part of it, we'll also sort of—as we start each of the sections, maybe come up with a sentence or two, sort of explaining why we do that particular thing in our weekly meetings. This is something we had discussed doing, and having just gone through the OFB one, I think it's kind of good to explain things to anyone that's been yearning to have something explained to them. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. And indeed, I noticed some new faces also around the room. So yeah, the CPWG deals with everything to do with policy in the At-Large community. At-Large does not make policy, but the ALAC At-Large Advisory Committee is allowed to provide input on any process that takes place at ICANN. We release statements, draft statements, and other things. Get involved in working groups, et cetera.

And so, the Consolidated Policy Working Group is the location where we discuss all of these topics among each other. It's open for everyone to take part in, so I think that's particularly important to mention. And we try and be very nice to each other, while at the same time coming up with hard-hitting, punchy statements on the points that our community feels are important in the ICANN processes.

And now that I've given you enough time to make any amendments, the agenda is adopted as it is currently on your screen, which means we can go to the action items. And I'm saying the screen. There's a screen here. You can also log in, of course, and look at it on the Zoom, yeah. So we have two action items still for today. So Avri, to follow-up on the 90-minute single topic discussion on the ICANN multi-stakeholder model and its contractual scope. Do we have an update on that, Avri?

AVRI DORIA: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

AVRI DORIA: I mean, it’s basically a discussion that needs to open more. I probably should have checked the items, but no. It's been talked about, but no, not yet. It's something also that I think we're going to schedule for after the meeting, and we're back into things to have that special topics. I think one of the things that we wanted to look at going forward is, one of the problems we've had in some of our meetings is we strangle subjects. We get them, and we've got a 30-minute's worth of discussion that we try to stuff into a 10-minute hole.

And one of the things here is basically to look at particular issues. In this case, the issue that many people had that instead of using the policy development processes for things, there's basically a contractual discussion between org and the contracted parties that sort of bypasses that. So, it's something that we talk about, we hand wave about the issue, but we want to basically schedule for sometimes after this meeting to basically focus on that for a bit.

And there's a lot of topics like that where we've talked about maybe it's every other week. That might be too often. Maybe it's at least a month to dedicate one of our meetings as opposed to our regular cycling of the working groups, and then, the IRTs, and then the comments to basically dedicate an hour or so, 90 minutes, whatever, to a particular subject that's particularly important to a lot of people within the At-Large. And to see what we can actually understand about it. So that's really an ongoing thing that I'm talking about a lot, but haven't done a thing about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. Maybe your first answer, no, which has been sufficient for the time being.

AVRI DORIA: Well, but there was more to be said.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm only kidding. Okay, thank you. Okay. And the second one, of course, is for our next online call that will be on the 27th of November. So let's move on, please, to the next agenda item. The substance of today's discussion. And we'll start first with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Usually, Steinar Grotterod is somewhere on a yacht around the world. He's sailed into the Bosphorus, and he happens to be right next to us. Over to you, Steinar.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Thank you very much. This is Steinar for the record. Do we have this presentation now, Andrew? Okay. So, my thinking today was to—actually, I can start doing a very, very short report from yesterday meeting in the PDP. And it was just a follow-up on some of the discussions that we had earlier this week regarding requirements for notification when there is a change of registrant data. In my view, I think we should spend more time on this when we have finalized the final wording on this one. But I have two slides here now, so we can take the next one.

I want to introduce to you where we are in this process. And this is something that we started back in 2021. And we are now approaching meeting number 100 and close to 150. So, I'm very happy to see the light in the tunnel. I don't believe it's the train coming back. I think we are on a good path here. As you see on the blue, on the diagram, in the bottom of the slides, we are working on the final report from the initial report. That was badly spoken. The objective here is to get that ready by February. And then, it goes into the GNSO Council. So we can take the next slide.

Yeah, there you are. Thank you. In my view, there was a set of questions that we had to answer in the initial report. And there are two questions that I think should be of importance for At-Large end-users. And this is the first one. It's something called the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, TDRP. The thing here is that the present policy is—this is a way to handle dispute when there is a transfer that has not come according to the policy. The only entities that can initiate this as of today is the registry operators and the registrars involved in the transfer.

We would like to have an option for the registrant to be part of and initiate dispute. This is tricky. I don't know why it's so tricky. But I have spoken to different stakeholders, also registrars, different [inaudible] and so on. The thing is that, it could be done, but they will see it as a PDP. They may have another three years before the end-user can actually have the chance to take part in a transfer dispute policy.

There are different ways of approaching this. I feel there are some support from some registrars that agree upon this logic that the registrant should be able to do this. Whether we succeed in this is a question. I had some nice constructive talks with the chair of the working group, some important registrars, [inaudible], the registrars, and there might be a middle way dealing with that. That registrant could be some sort of—let me rephrase it. If we make a policy that makes it possible for the registrant to have data that is important for trying to solve a dispute when there is something that has gone wrong in the transfer from one registrar to another registrar. That might be the middle road here. That might be something that we can look up.

So, we will be interested to see when the working group is putting the comments that are received during the initial phase together with our comment. And then, how this has been taken by the working group itself. So, I will keep you posted on that one during the CPWG meetings. And the next one—we can take the next slide.

And this is the other comment that we actually made to the initial report. And this is when—let's start it that way. The proposed recommendation from the working group is that, when there is a change of the registration data, this is to be taken out of the transfer policy, but have to be in a separate standalone policy. And the working group agreed upon that. And so, it's more or less up to the registrar how to implement this. But there are certain criteria that will be given to this standalone policy.

We in this meeting, this forum, we agreed to say that when there is something that we call a material change, there should be a lock preventing a transfer to another registrar for 30 days. I disagree in that, but I spoke with the handful, with the argument that this group asked me to do. The reason why I disagree in that is that this is the data. That this is the most challenging thing for ICANN compliance, that they get end-users in saying, "I did an update on my email address for this domain name, and now I'm locked out for transferring this domain into another registrar."

So maybe we should have a second round on that one, or maybe we should stick to what we said. So, I'm not sure, but I'm not too happy about that. That may be the best way to say that.

So, the final slide, we can take the slides, and I guess, this will be published on the agenda. These are links to the different wikis or tools that the working group is using for finalizing the report to the GNSO. And I normally also try to make a presentation and add to the presentation important things about how these things are going on in the working group. So, these are maybe something that if you want to follow it, and I really hope that you want to follow it and comment and assist me in arguing the way we want to have it. Please bookmark this and submit your comment to this report. So, that was my less than 10 minutes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Let's open the floor for any comments or questions. You've done very well. Thank you very much. And of course, this topic is extremely important for end-users since how many of us know of people who complain about having had a real problem with transferring their registrar, the organization they get their domain from. They're not happy with one. They want to go somewhere else, and it's very hard. So, it's great that you've done—how many, 150 meetings? 150 meetings, thank you. I remember when you were young, when you started back in the day, all of us. Anyway.

Now we're going to go very swiftly through the headlines that we see in the policy workgroup and small team updates. We don't have an update for them. But as you can see, there are tabs with all these acronyms. The first one is the Expedited Policy Development Process on the internationalized domain names. That's any domain name that is not in the Latin or not using the Latin character set. The next one is the Registration Data Request Service. Well, it is what it says on the tin actually. How to request registration data.

The next one is the IANA Naming Function Review. IANA being the organization or the part of ICANN that deals with the registry of the protocol parameters and the IP addresses and the root zone. And then, you've got the RDA Scoping Team, Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. It's good to have registration data. It's also even better for it to be accurate. No updates on any of these. Some of them are nearing the end of their cycle. Some of them are pending at the moment.

We do have an update on the Latin Script Diacritics. So, the Latin Script Diacritics—well, actually, the person giving us the update is probably going to tell us what these are. So, I'll hand the floor over to Satish Babu. Welcome, Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. Satish for the record. This is a very brief update on the status of the Latin Diacritics PDP. First of all, this is an issue with a lot of end-user importance. We have Louis and friends from Quebec, who have been relentlessly asking for this. And this particular development is a testimony to their perseverance that they've been at it for a long time.

Secondly, I appreciate the support from Andrew and the policy team. They've been providing support for this whole thing. The current status is that the preliminary charter is now ready based on the initial report and the public comments. So, we have actually received about 41 public comments of which 37 are in support of a PDP, initiating a PDP, which is pretty overwhelming. Two have mixed support with caution. One is against and one is having problems with the choice of words like variant, which they feel that it is not kind of appropriate.

So, the current status is that the GNSO is ready to vote on initiating a PDP, which we are hoping will happen during ICANN81 or latest by 19th December, at which point the PDP will get initialized. Actually, currently, it's only me, but I welcome volunteers to join the team. We will provide an update during the CPWG on 27th about the substantive aspects of the report, the draft charter.

So, as it stands, we have people like Bill who have been working on the aspects of diacritics, which he has personally expressed reservations. But the team has not taken into account those reservations. With the result, we are here where we are right now having to address this in an exceptional manner. But as of now, it would appear that we don't need to substantively review the initial draft charter. It seems to be okay and there seems to be general acceptance. So, we may not require a full-fledged statement. Anyway, there's no time or opportunity for a statement.

So, as it stands, we feel that the council is going to vote on this and it's going to initiate a PDP. And the PDP will be based on a kind of representative model, where ALAC also will have representatives and that is where we can join the team and kind of provide our inputs during that process. So, to summarize, currently, we don't require a review, but the details of the draft charter we will make available during the CPWG meeting on 27 November. Thanks and back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. What is a diacritic? I think maybe that was the first question I was going to ask.

SATISH BABU: So this has got some amount of overlap with the EPDP and IDNs which talks about IDN variants. A variant of a particular letter is what the language community considers to be equivalent. For example, an E with an accent and an E without an accent. Unfortunately, the Latin Generation Panel said that these are not equivalents, and they have their own logic. And Bill has actually talked about this earlier, why they have their own logic. But for the language communities of Quebec, they are absolute equivalents.

So there is a problem there which is what we've been trying to resolve through this process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Olivier speaking. Bill Jouris?

BILL JOURIS: Bill Jouris for the record. To answer the question you actually asked, a diacritic is a little mark that goes over or sometimes under a letter. The tilde over the N in Spanish, the acute accent in French, et cetera, et cetera. There are some 20 different diacritics that are used in one language or another for some letter. So that's the issue as Satish said. There are equivalents in use, but the Latin Generation Panel with seven people obviously did not have experts in all 1,000 languages that use the Latin script or some variation on it. So, that's where the issue arose. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Bill. I don't see any other hands up. So, that is all for the Latin Script Diacritic PDP. Thank you very much for your update, Satish. And of course, as I mentioned, our own groups here are focusing on all these topics. And if you're interested in these, then please speak to the people that are listed on the agenda or you can speak to Andrew, who's sitting next to me, and express your interest and take part in the discussions that take place in between our meetings.

Now I'm going to hand the floor over to my co-chair, Avri Doria, for the Implementation Review Teams. Over to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Olivier. So, the next thing we've got is the Subsequent Procedures Implementation. Well, actually, I didn't want to go to that first. If we could go back to—I wanted to walk through the tabs, as Olivier did, just to show what's going there. So, we've talked about the IRTs, the Implementation Review Teams. And for anyone that's new, this is a perfect opportunity to sort of get involved in things. There are official representatives in the IRTs from all the supporting organizations and the advisory committees that want to participate. At-Large definitely has them.

If you go to the first one, the PPSAI, the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation, we have Alan Greenberg with Greg Shatan as the alternate. Now, what happens each week is we ask whether there is an update that they wish to make. And then at each meeting, I ask, once again, any late coming updates to make? And often, I get the answer, no, there isn't, but I just want to make sure. I'm assuming there isn't this time.

GREG SHATAN: This is Greg Shatan for the record. No.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And that was a definitive no, so thank you very much. As opposed to the nos I give that call for a long explanation afterwards. Okay. So then, moving on to new gTLD next round. What used to be called SubPro. That one is very active IRT. We have several representatives in it. Justine, who's probably off doing it at the moment, or in some other GNSO thing, and Cheryl. Cheryl has an update, and the floor is yours, Cheryl. So now, please, go to the slide deck. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Avri. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, and hopefully—there we go. It's all up now. Right. I feel like starting. Well, I'm going to follow you, Steinar. Four score and 20 years ago. Not quite. It was coming up now for three years ago. We finished a little around six years of work on what was called subsequent procedure. So that kind of puts it into perspective. The Implementation Review Team is a really vital and important part of making sure that huge body of work and all those recommendations that came out of that Policy Development Process gets to the actionable part, becomes operationalized in a way that does not disconnect or lose the intent and meaning from the original policy work.

So when you hear terms like IRT or Implementation Review Team—sorry, I'm strangling myself here with my translation device. That's better. What it means is a group of interested people, but also, people who were involved in the development of the recommendations, acting in concert with ICANN staff to ensure that, for example, this case, the language, the applicant guidebook, which goes with the new gTLD program to assist applicants to know what to do, how to do and what is possible, what the limitations are and what the consequences are of making their applications. That that activity is not disconnected from the original intent.

Now, that's just to sort of frame up what an IRT is and why Justine and I and others, and I'll pull out Avri here, she has been—well, she says she's just an observer. She's probably got one of the best attendance records of anybody. It is open to observers. It is actually a very interesting process. It is a very drafting-based and iterative one. So in the case of this particular IRT, we go through reams and reams and reams of text and we wordsmith and we review. It's not the most exciting thing you may wish to get involved with, but it is an extraordinarily important part of the accountability of how we get from policy, which is what this group works on. Part of that policy process that you've heard about today, and actually making it happen. There's a word there. Look it up.

Now, I would like to recognize that all I have done in preparation for representing Justine and I's work running in sort of an annual general meeting approach for this section is not even plagiarized, just literally lifted the slide deck from one of the five meetings that we are holding here today with the IRT. Because why should we develop new decks when somebody else has taken time, energy and effort to do something? So you're going to get a little sick of scrolling through and I'm going to jump the bits that aren't relevant.

What I would like to do is draw your attention to some of these statistics. Now, these statistics, the slide decks used, the meetings, the recordings, the discussions, all the gory details on every single one of the 89, I think, we're up to meetings. We'll be hitting 100 meetings in December. I think December 19th or something is our 100th meeting. All of these are in a dedicated wiki space and I would encourage anybody who wants to dig into this to please look at and star or mark in the wiki system so that you get an update when something like a new item goes into an agenda.

But these statistics are regularly repeated. What I wanted to draw your attention to is that particularly, our ALAC, and it's not just ALAC members, there are At-Large individuals as well, have been very much engaged in the whole process, even though there's 106 members and 86 of the IRT meetings have been held at the point of this. We had two more since this slide deck. The attendance is quite good, but we also run in sub-tracks, which means for some people there will be an additional 50 meetings involved in all of this.

What is exciting is, if you look at, and particularly the topics on the right of your screen as opposed to the board decisions on outputs which none of us can do anything about anyway. They accepted some, modified others, adopted with clarifying statements and didn't adopt a couple. That is just what it is. But if you look at the topic status, we are very much along a completion timeline. So we have very few things that we're still working on the drafting for. So the org staff are working only on draft language for four specific topics. We have draft finalized for—there are a couple of non-applicables for 10 and final review for another seven.

There will be a public comment on a grouping of them coming out in December this year. That makes December terribly busy. If you were here in the earlier operations, finance and budget working group. You'll hear that there was a lot going to happen in public comments in that space as well, but there's also going to be, 15, I think it is, topics all bundled in together in this end of year period. So a busy time for both of our foundational committees here.

I wanted to also just scroll down a tiny bit further and jump over this and just let you know that if we look here at the breakdown of topics, and the type of topics we've done, it has been a busy particularly year. But overall, two years, we see no indication that there will be any delay in the timeline for the 2026 launch. So fingers crossed, nothing happens to take us off our track there.

But I also wanted to let you know, just skipping over some of this. Sorry about the dizziness there. This is important in terms of our November to December work activity. We'll be preparing what we need to do for the first quarter of 2025. We will also be looking at—when you talk about red lines, that's where the members of the IRT or the observers have made some comments and suggestions for change to the drafted text that's all discussed and considered. That then becomes a new final or penultimate draft and that will be done for the first and second quarter in 2025. And of course, the most exciting part of all of this is that we will be heading around May to have all topics inclusive, applicant guidebook out for public comment.

And there will be an opportunity for the CPWG, for this group where we have made public comment or decided not to in some cases, make public comment on matters that have already gone out for public comment regarding what goes into the applicant guidebook. And indeed, the applicant support program. In the end of time, in the May period, there will be a second possibility to revisit should you decide you do want to make some particular comment. So, it's not quite the last opportunity, but you can see it's coming up soon.

And the only other thing I wanted to mention is, if you look at the types of things that we've got left to discuss, any of you who happen to have contract experience or loyally types, there's lots of lovely things about base registry agreements coming up and a little bit too coming in from the Internationalized Domain Names sub-track as well. But if what gets you excited is contracts and the arcaneness of words that go into those sorts of things, feel free to join us even though it's getting towards the end of our work because these meetings, I will just remind you, are public. They are open and you are more than welcome.

Now I'm just going to stop sharing and take you on a small and very brief journey on a couple of matters that both Justine and I would like to bring to the attention of this group and hopefully to the attention of the At-Large Advisory Committee. Two things, in yesterday's—one of the three meetings we attended when we were talking about a mechanism that will allow for what's called a contention set, which is when more than one applicant would like to get the same name, the same string, there has to be a process of sorting that out.

I'm not going into what that was but part of that is something called a bid credit to be applied or to be provided for successful applicant support program, applicants for a new name. Now, that is vitally important because if you are able to become an applicant support program entity and it's the entity that is supported, it isn't any string as such, all that does is mean that there will be certain advantages, predominantly financial, in other words reduction of fee. But not only financial, there is going to be considerable in-kind and other support services provided to the successful applicant support program entities.

But if that entity which has already proved the financial hardship aspect gets into a resolution of a contention set where the ability to bid cold hard cash and outbid someone else comes into play, clearly that's not going to be terribly fair because we can pretty much guarantee that they're not going to have the deep pockets that perhaps a brand may have. So, this thing called bid credit has been discussed and supported.

In our discussion of that yesterday, what I was personally horrified, and those who know me well, will assume that there's a number of other adjectives that the Aussie will put in later when you talk to me, but not for the public record right now. To say the least I was unimpressed with pushback from at least one person in the room, not only on the bid credit concept, but it seemed to me to be the rationale on to why we were doing applicant support program at all.

So, team, watch this space carefully, and if you've got your GAC friends, get them to watch this space carefully because we've worked too darn long and too darn hard to make sure diversity and underserved regions are appropriately included, if at all possible, in this next round. And we're not wanting a particularly good orator to get a whole bunch of sheep. Oh dear, I did sneer, didn't it? Following them, going, oh yeah, that's a bloody good idea. Yeah, yeah. No, we don't want that to happen. Right. Okay. That's my rant.

One other thing that I know Justine is very keen for us to raise, particularly with the think tank that this group is, and that is to do with the ALAC objections process. Now, a small team has finished a fantastic amount of work on revitalizing, reviewing and reproducing hopefully something that's not like a bus dragging a horse and cart with it, which is what the last one was like. A system for a bottom-up, consensus-built process, which is accountable and terribly, terribly transparent for the development of something that could even possibly become a complaint, an ALAC complaint. Objection, I should say.

Now, that is great. That will be going into the applicant guidebook, but objections cost. We will get support for that, but what we don't have, because it didn't become a recommendation out of the SubPro work now, nine years back, is something called standing. And we have to find a way, ladies and gentlemen, of getting in the ear of—I'd suggest probably the board, to ensure that if all of this work goes on, we are not rejected because some panel decides we don't have standing. So, if they're the two alarms, we need to watch those spaces carefully. And that's it from me and Justine. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Cheryl. I missed that IRT meeting yesterday, but now you've reminded me that I really do need to go back and listen to it, because I'm very curious about who. And the whole discussion there, so thank you very much. One comment I wanted to mention, those meetings are all recorded, so you don't actually have to be there at the time to listen to them. In terms of actually going to the meeting as an observer, it is totally open but before actually participating as an observer, you have to go through the GNSO statement of interest, because they want to make sure that anyone that is voicing an opinion—anybody can listen later to the recording, but if you're voicing an opinion, they want to make sure that they know who you're speaking for.

And if you happen to be planning to apply for something, that's perfectly fine. You just have to say that I work for a company that's considering to apply for something, and just to do the statement of interest. So, anybody can observe, but to actually attend the meeting—not here, you sit in the back of the room, but on the call. So, did anybody have any questions on that? It was a really quite good report. So, thanks. Did anybody have any questions on all of that? Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just to add on the point of standing, looking at how it all happened last—last time it happened, many years ago, the ALAC did go through all the motions and everything. And what we were told at the end is the ALAC does not represent the objector, and therefore, the objection is void. And that is really annoying. So obviously, we need to find a way to have this ability to object to be ingrained somehow, no matter how connected we are to the community that is making the objection.

The difficulty is the strict interpretation of the community. The ALAC is, and the At-Large community is a community, but it's not a defined community with some paperwork that provides you with a badge or something that connects you directly to the objector. So anyway, there we are.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes. Please, Claire.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Yes. Claire Craig for the record. Thank you, Cheryl, for bringing to our attention the issue of the standing, and Olivier for reminding us what happened previously since some of us would not have been part of that process. Now, my question really, I know Cheryl, you said we have to find ways, but should we do maybe some kind of advice to the board or something like that? Is there something concrete that we can do rather than waiting and hoping that something will come out of this? And then at the end of the day, we all sit back and say, “Oh, well, we tried our best.” Is there some kind of suggestion that we may want to do at this point in time? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Oh, I sincerely hope so, Claire. As vice-chair of the ALAC, I would suggest you're in a very good position to raise this with the ALAC. And Justine continues to serve on the ALAC, but both she and I would be more than happy to either, in a formal meeting or otherwise, put some briefings together on this including the historical stuff.

I am afraid we cannot look to any success to bring it up within the IRT. We cannot get success within the IRT because it is not a recommendation from SubPro. It was discussed but not recommended. So that is not a pathway. So, the ALAC must find a pathway to get this at least to the attention for positive outcome. Otherwise, we are simply setting ourselves up for exactly what happened last time.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you both, Claire, for the question and Cheryl for the answer. Steinar, please.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah. Hi, this is Steinar for the record. First of all, this is going to be exacting times. I was actually working with the previous round, and I know there's a lot of hard work going on and so on. What I'm also kind of curious to know is, as far as I understand, the application fee has not been set yet. It is set. Can you indicate the level of that application fee? One of the success criteria is also that this may be some sort of a showstopper for some good approaches. One thing is the application fee.

The other thing is the annual fee to ICANN, which is more my experience from working with small TLD in the last round was that the application fee is more easy to get approved from local communities, but it is the annual fee that is really the showstopper because some of these gTLDs, the language culture TLDs in that time, they had to make—the politicians as an example, had to make promises for annual fees. And that is very hard for a politician to do. So, I'd like to have the hard facts of this. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, I wasn't sure what you were suggesting Steinar should be doing. Okay, two things. First of all, I'm having a geriatric moment and I'm not going to misquote the US dollars, but it's an increase of some 20 to 30K on what it was last time. So it's a significantly larger amount than it was last time. I will take that on notice and ensure it is in writing, literally, probably before the end of this meeting. I just have to stop and look it up.

But yes, it can be a showstopper and that is why the Applicant Support Program is so important. But of course, that's only going to meet some of the potential need you've raised, because there would be diaspora or certain communities that will have difficulty. That will not meet the criteria of the Applicant Support Program. Some of this is just going to get through the net, I'm afraid, this time round.

However, there has been consideration on the annual and ongoing fees. And a lot of what this new Applicant Support Program has looked at is how to assist a ramping up, both coming up to becoming a registry and in those nascent days of being a registry, and so, yes, there is a formula which Maureen's group worked on to allow for an ability to pay less but work up to paying full amount.

Now that's brought us to a very important point if I could just expand, and that is, one of the aims of the applicant support program is that a successful not only applicant support in entity but a successful applicant for a new name should we hope with that sort of credential, with that sort of proven case study that the business model has been looked at, it's been gone over with a fine-tooth comb. We hope they're in a better position to raise other funds.

And so, in that period of becoming a registry, we would love to see applicant support, program supported entities say, “Oh, and by the way, I no longer meet the criteria and therefore I will not be taking those posts going into the route and early registry operations benefits, and we're just working on the details and nuances of that, so we will take that as something we will come back to the CPWG on when we have final language, but yes, it is being considered.”

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri again. I also don't remember the number, it was so shockingly high, I think I blocked it from my memory. But one of the things I did want to mention is, that's just a base fee. All the various appeals or responding to objections, making objections, contention, every one of those comes with a fee. And some of the speculation after the last round is that between half a million and a million was probably what you needed to budget in the long run to make it to the end of the process successfully.

Not everyone, but it's really—so the fee is really when you find it out and you're shocked by the number, you'll realize it's only the starter fee. Anyone else have any questions before we move on? Anybody actually remember the number and remember having read it in the email? As I look around, I'm sure that there are some that know it. But also, I should say that even when it came out, that was still only a last approximation. There was still a note saying, it could shift and it always—not always, but mostly shifts upwards.

Okay. If there's no other questions on that one, I don't see any there. I don't see any placards, so okay. So, then let's move on. And the next part of the CPWG work that's done on a daily—not daily, is the policy statements. As everyone knows, there are public comments and everyone, whether you're a sporting organization, an advisory committee, an individual, a company, whatever is invited too. Often, the CPWG decides to recommend to ALAC that they submit a comment during the public comment period. That comment is developed with great help from Andrew and crew, but mostly by members of the CPWG who get together and write the thing.

And then it's sent on to ALAC, where there's a voting process that they go through for accepting it. That's what this part is about. Whenever there's a public comment, there's usually something like 40 days, 45 days, some limit of time. So, it is very much of a crunch type of thing where we—I'll get to you in a second, Claire. Where we sort of talk about, do we want to do a comment? Do we need to do a comment? Is there somebody here that has something to say in a comment? Do we agree on it?

It gets put together, it gets discussed, it gets wordsmiths in the CPWG. And then, if approved by the group, it's sent on to ALAC for a vote. They're usually supposed to have several days to a week to do that, but given the short range of time we have, we are often crunching those into a couple days, and I'm very grateful for the lack of complaint, at least that I've heard, from ALAC about having to do those quick turnarounds. So, Claire, before I go on to specifics, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks, Avri. Claire Craig for the record. I just wanted to use this opportunity to make a plug for one of the public comments for the OFB, which is the ICANN community participation code of conduct for the SOIs and general ethics policy. The call for volunteers for that one has not yet gone out. We should be sending that out shortly. You will see that the deadline is the second of December. We don't have an OFB call before then. And so, we will have to be working on that online. So, for that reason, we would like people to sign up as soon as possible once the call goes out, and they should respond to At-Large staff so that we can get that process going. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, and I'll accept that personal call personally, since it's something that I have been having a strong opinion about in various of our meetings lately, so I'll try to do my bit. I know you weren't making it to me specifically, but I am taking it personally. Okay. So, the last one – if there’s no questions to start. So the last one we did was one in response to the proposed renewal of the registry agreement for dot com. We did have a brief comment on that. It was one that was arrived at rather late. It went through a fair amount of discussion to get to the comment we got to, and it was sent through, and I'm told that it was approved and sent forward.

So, thank you very much to everybody, both in the CPWG and ALAC, for processing that one really quite quickly at the end. Then going through the rest of the list here. At the moment, the one we got—no, please don't move it, because I'm still reading it. The one at the top there, which is just disappearing, is a recommendation on the deselection-selection of IDN ccTLDs and related variants. We had a discussion on that. It was the recommendation of the experts that looked at it that there was no need for a comment.

One of the things that I try to do when we have these determinations early, and it says no statement, it means we've made an initial statement, is if I've got the time to come around to it one more time and say, are we sure? It's kind of like doing a second reading of a bill. So, whenever we have the time to that, just in case somebody fell asleep or someone had a dream and realized that, no, we really need to comment, get a last chance. Satish, please.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Avri. Satish, for the record. Good point. So, we plan to meet this week to once again review this whole process, and we'll get back if there's any change in the position. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Just note that it's due the 22nd so if your decision is that we come back and have to do one, please do one, because there will be no time afterwards. But thank you very much. You guys have gone through it very methodically. We've had several conversations on it. Basically, just so you know what happens is, when we'll get to that, there'll be nobody in the reviewer's name. And I'll call out and say, “Does anybody have a strong opinion? Are you willing to be a reviewer? Are you willing to join the reviewer team, et cetera?” And the team gets sort of self-built by the people that feel there's something that needs to be said.

It can also be joined by someone that feels that you guys are saying too much and I want to negotiate with you about what you're saying. So, you don't have to just be strongly in favor of a comment. You could also think that a comment's not appropriate and join the reviewer team just to come up to that proper balance for it. At the moment, you'll see that the rest of the ones on the list here are OFB Working Group. I think the one that Claire just mentioned is the second one on the list. The first one on the list was the ICP-2. There's a pending decision. There's a pending decision on the one that Claire mentioned.

And normally, I do not misappropriate—I try not to misappropriate yours, but since I'm going through this, I figured I'd mention them with apology. Pending decision on the one that Claire just mentioned, the

Community Participation Code of Conduct on SOIs and General Ethics Policy. And then, there's one, the proposed revisions to Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Oh, that's the one I've got very strong opinions on. It's not the first one that I have the opinions on. It's that second one. Yes, Claire?

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks, Avri. Claire again. That's the one that we really have to do the call for volunteers for. And that should be coming out shortly, and we're looking for persons to be part of that as soon as possible. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: And I've already publicly committed myself to being on that crowd. So, any questions on any of that before I move on? Oh, let me check the—oh, where is the participants? Doing these things when I have three screens in front of me at home is so much easier. Okay, that's it for that part, so let's move on to the next. So also, then there's a list here, and I won't necessarily go through it, of the upcoming public comment proceedings. And there's several. Two of them are OFB working group, and the one that we have is the second IANA Naming Function Review team draft report. So that one will be coming our way in the next month, I guess, within the next month.

Okay. Any questions on that section before I move on? Okay. Then moving on is we had a board engagement on prep week. And basically, since there was no chance to talk afterwards, since this is the first CPWG meeting after that engagement with the board and I guess, we've got another engagement with the board later this week that Jonathan has been handling. But maybe also be a good place to bring up the issue about standing that we talked about earlier.

But anyhow, I really just wanted to open the floor on the two topics that we discussed and anybody that participated in it, if anybody had any comments or opinions that we wanted to talk about. And the first topic was the future of the new gTLD program applications, and the shepherd on that was Justine. Justine is off doing her work. But for anybody that participated in that, anyone that listened to the call, anybody that's just read about it, any comments, any opinions? How did it go? Was it a good discussion? Was there some point that wasn't made that should have been made that's basically sort of coming back to you all and sort of saying, okay, how was that?

Because often when you're in those calls with the board, they get sort of proper. They get sort of formal. It's hard to get a word in edgewise, in other words. Anybody have a comment on it? Something that should have been said. Something that was said that is considered unfortunate. No? I mean, it was led by Becky and Alan. It was a discussion and a soliciting of input. So, everybody feels that that call went well? It's a good model for the future. Nothing to add to it. Okay. Then I'll move on.

The next one, and I know Alan's not here, but Greg is here if there's something to talk about there. It had to do with the RDRS community feedback and the format of the engagement was discussed. And the board wanted to understand the community's perception. And I think the folks from At-Large and ALAC gave them a perception. I don't know if anybody wanted to cover any of that, to add anything to it. Are we content with that discussion with the board? Are these a good worthwhile use of time? I guess, they must be. Nobody's objecting. Did anybody listen to that call after not being at the call? Just curious. Do the recordings get used?

I'm assuming you all did not make the call. So, I recommend that you listen to some of these calls. They're good either for waking up in the morning or going to sleep at night, however, they affect you. But I do recommend that even if you can't make them, and I know there are horrible times and in the middle of the night or when you're at work or something, but they're all available for listening and I really do recommend.

I can sleep any time. I could fall asleep in the middle of this room if I was given the chance. So, it's the advantage of always being tired. So, I really recommend that people go back and listen to those as much as possible and follow-up and keep yourself going and listening.

The next topic we had was the next steps for the board engagement session, which had Jonathan's name on it. But I do not see a Jonathan. Do we happen to have up the—queued up the cheat sheet, the points sheet for that conversation. I don't know if you have it, Andrew, and I did not tell you in advance that I was going to ask.

ANDREW CHEN: Apologies, Avri. This is Andrew for the record. That is supposed to be removed.

AVRI DORIA: It's supposed to be?

ANDREW CHEN: Yes. That was in preparation for the call itself, which was due on October 30th.

AVRI DORIA: Uh-huh. So that we have a 60-minute session that will feature two breakout rooms. Oh, that thing with the breakout rooms. Each hosted by different board members. Okay, got it. So, we've had that. Yeah, okay. So, there isn't another session planned with the boards for this week? Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I don't have an answer actually about your last question. There is a session with the board. There definitely is, yeah. On the preparation thing, I was going to feedback on this. And I think we might have gone a little too far into it, a little too quickly into it and perhaps since we do have the time, we could have a discussion around the table again. I know that on a previous CPWG call, we already had a discussion which gave rise among a number of documents to our talking points document, and perhaps we should take people through this quickly if we haven't got a meaningful or an extensive interaction on the two pre-week sessions.

What I was surprised about during those sessions is the format that was there, which was a workshop format, where everyone got distributed into sub-rooms and I ended up wanting to be in more than one room at the same time. Unfortunately, Zoom does not allow this. So, I was kind of stuck into one room, and then things happened extremely fast. And before I know it, we're back into the main room, and it was over. It was extremely quick and there were a lot of participants also during this.

So yes, you are correct in that. Alan Greenberg, who was perhaps the person that was meant to be presenting the At-Large point of view, did speak and there was some expression of this community's perception of the topic and our positions on it. But I think it went so quickly. I'm not quite sure what the board took out of this and it might be interesting, when we speak to them informally, board members informally, it might be interesting to kind of feed on what they thought the community talked about, and what they thought the community said during that session.

So that's my feedback on the session. But I was a bit disappointed that we had these sub-teams, sub-rooms, and then there didn't appear to be some proper formal way of bringing things back into the main conclusion at the end. It was all a bit abrupt. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Olivier. Avri, again. Yeah, in fact, it was—the only way to listen to two rooms is to have several machines. So that was the advantage of the bank of three machines in front of me. I was able to track the two of them. But you're right, there was no bringing it together. It was sort of the board listened, the board took what they took. And that may be an interesting topic to bring up, as you say, when we're in discussion, just like it may be—oh, I see your sign, thanks.

And then to bring up also the whole notion of the standing. I think that if there is a void of topics we want to talk about with the board, using it for standing may indeed be a good thing to do when we're with them. Yes, Claire.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Thanks, Avri. Claire Craig for the transcript record. I take Olivier's point, and we had a similar issue last year. If you recall, when we had the prep meeting with the board, and I think one of the places that this can come up, rather than informally, is at the public forum. Because the board was very interested to hear that last year was the first time they had done it and there were issues. And so, we need to continue to let them know that there are things that they need to work on so that this can be improved over time.

So yes, bring it up informally, but I think we also need to bring it up formally, so that there is a record, so that it can be addressed at some future point. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, Avri, again. I think one of the points is bring it up once, bring it up twice, bring it up as often as there's a chance to bring it up in different ways by different people at different times. There's a lot of value in persistence. It's sometimes not appreciated. Well, you can't put it down because that might be called harassment, but it's sometimes not sufficiently value. Yet persistence in my 15 plus years of ICANN participation is probably one of the few formulas that actually works in the long run. Having money might work too, but persistence really does work.

Okay. Anybody else want to talk anything more about either the debrief that we've been having or the upcoming meeting? Yes, Hadia, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien as well, Sébastien and Hadia.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I called on Hadia first and then Sébastien. Apologies if I got the order wrong.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you. This is Hadia. My question is actually related to the standing issue. I was wondering if actually ALAC is putting an objection on behalf of an accredited ALS or an individual member of one of the RALOS? Does this standing issue still exist? Because ALS as individual members are actually approved and accredited by the RALO and ALAC. That's just a question. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: It's a good question. Thank you. Avri, again. It's a good question. I don't know the answer. It might be worth asking if we have a discussion of going from the—we are not the community that's injured. You're not the community that pertains. Who do you have to be? So, it's both the notion of, are you a formal attached to a community and there's also the, how does it affect you? And one of the problems that I know At-

Large and ALAC had last time is explaining how it affected them. And they said, "Well, you know, we're representing the interests," but does it affect you in a material sense and getting caught in that. And trying to overcome that notion of, to file a comment, to file an objection that you need to have material.

And basically, that's one of the things I think Alan brought up and I'm sure Greg can correct me. Greg can always correct me even if he shakes his head that he can't. Is that notion that the public objector or whatever, his proper title or her proper title or their proper title is not physically there, is not materially harmed specifically themselves. They're doing it on behalf. And basically, what Alan I think was looking for is that At-Large/ALAC should have that same standing as the public objector does because it's representing the interest of someone who can't materially do it themselves either financially, because they happen to be a group that doesn't pay attention to us on a daily basis or such. And you almost look like you were ready to say something, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: This is Greg Shatan for the record. Just to clarify, it's the independent objector. Not to be confused with the central scrutinizer from Joe's garage.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I messed up the name. I appreciate it. But is it true that that independent objector can object on behalf of just about anyone?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, everyone except me for some reason. I'm just joking. It's like you can object on anyone else's behalf.

AVRI DORIA: And so, basically, At-Large is looking to basically have a similar capability even if I use the wrong words.

GREG SHATAN: Correct, and the problem may be that we have no standing at all even to object for any of our constituents. So, it's a problematic situation.

AVRI DORIA: So, it seems like it may be worth talking about this with the board when we get a chance and getting somebody to talk about it who won't stumble over their words like I so often do. So, it's something to keep in mind. So, if I turn to you during the meeting or I turn to Alan, it'll basically be to—okay, thank you. I think I've covered that one enough. Oh, no. I see a card up. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So I've just been told by the great big power in the sky, that unseen power, that the formal/informal report is not ready yet and that's one of the topics that will be taken away from our interactions with the board. And therefore, we could add the topic of a follow-up from the prep meeting with the board as a question to the board. Tapping their feedback on what they've heard from the community.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thanks. And that was your topic, right, the informal?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was Jonathan's topic.

AVRI DORIA: Jonathan's topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan formally found out informal was not formally done anyway.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Anyhow—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a formal request.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. Okay, we've got five minutes left, so I think I'm going to cut the discussion on that. But hopefully, we can actually get some decent board engagement going forward on some of these critical questions. And I know that can be—oh, Sébastien, I'm so sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Good morning, everyone. This is Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I will be speaking French, as you will have seen. Thank you. First, I would like to go back to the board-organized meeting. I think we should remain optimistic. The fact that the board organizes meetings, engagement meetings during the prep week allows us to engage and to discuss one or two subjects. And we can very well say, "Well, I couldn't attend both." And I understand that we cannot attend everything at once, but for the great majority of participants in this room, the very fact that we could attend one of the discussions is interesting enough.

So, I think we should be a bit more optimistic about this board-led initiative, which is subject to some improvement, indeed. But it is what it is, and that's something already. And then, those who could attend prepared a report in two groups. So even if you couldn't follow, then you did find out what had gone on in the other room.

Anyway, I wanted to go back to something else. Yesterday, during the introduction, I mentioned something and it's been about a day and a half that we've been meeting, and I haven't seen this subject discussed. I don't know if this is the place to go back to this, but I think there is an urgent subject, a hot topic, a number of hot topics that are not reflected in our lists here or in what we anticipated. And well, as you will have seen, there are a number of developments that have taken place in the world. There is a new president of the USA. So, I think we should consider what the impact of that would be for ICANN and for our work.

Where do you think we should discuss that? Where do you think we should reflect on the potential consequences that that will have for ICANN? You could very well tell me that will be done within six months.

But six months from now, he will be in office, and he will already have started making decisions. So, I will leave it at that. I don't want to take any more of your time for this meeting out of the time we have available. But I would like to ask you that we go back to this and that we consider this at some point during the week with the rest of the community. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. One of the things we have to be careful of, and we don't discuss a lot of that, elections. I see Presidents being elected all the time. And while I have my own views of my country, we tend to stay away from that specific who's elected and is it good and is it bad and is it dangerous, whatever we may think. So, one of the things that—and I know we've talked about this, is waiting for actions that portend problems. And an election in itself may not be sufficient, because that takes us into the realm of politics as opposed to.

But also, if you're looking for a place where that all happened, there's the political, not political, there's the whole WSIS, the whole discussion of the geopolitics of the DNS and everything that will be discussed later. So that may be the most appropriate place to bring those specific topics up at this point. And yes, we're in any other business, by the way, because this definitely is other business.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry for that, Avri. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Yeah, it may be discussed there. First of all, it's run by my staff, not big deal, but it's not by the community. And my point is, can we discuss that here? I am not talking about the result of the election. I am not talking if we agree or disagree, but what could be the consequences? And that's not politics, it's the future of ICANN. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Yeah, thank you. Any other, other business? Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Following up on what Sébastien just mentioned, I think we have a plenary. And on that, we are talking about—the title is Shifting Paradigms, and we will discuss politics, geopolitics. And I think that would be a good place to bring this discussion, because it's actually impacting ALAC directly, because this is about end-users and their rights to speak up. As we move more to nationalistic kind of policies, which US is going to move towards that, I think it's very important that we be proactive.

And another thing I want to add is also, I have been trying tirelessly to bring the issue of environment into the agenda and unfortunately, each time I mention it, it's somehow magically removed from the agenda. In five years' time, we have to meet SDGs, and it's very important for us to be proactive. And again, that's something that I like to support, and I don't see enough support here. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Any other comments, questions? Does that one come up in that geopolitical—what is it? The geopolitics session on Monday? Isn't that inappropriate to bring it up?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's about emerging technologies and geopolitics. So, I may touch on it, but it's not really a place. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Any other, other business? So, we need to look for those things. Any other? We've hit time in any case, so I turn it over to you, Olivier, to talk about our next encounter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking and yes, this is not the end. Of course, we will continue our meetings. The next one will take place online, of course, on Wednesday the 27th of November at 1400 UTC. The meeting with the board is taking place tomorrow from 1630 to 1730. ICANN board and ALAC, and this is where we'll follow up with some of the topics that we've spoken about today, and we'll be discussing these with the board.

And then, I should also make one more announcement, which is someone's anniversary of having joined this community and done an extremely excellent job. He joined us as a young gentleman. He's sitting next to me. His name is Andrew Chen, and he's done really well this year to support this group.

As you'll notice, the co-chairs both have white hair, and Andrew is about to get white hair too, so he'll be there soon. Anyway, I hope you've enjoyed the time, and I think we've run out of time, actually. So unless there's anything else that we need to add, thank you very much to everyone for having attended. And thanks to our interpreters for having dealt with our tongue-twisting acronyms, et cetera. So, thanks, everyone. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]